

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 19, 2005 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claims 34 and 53-59 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 34-59 are pending in the application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 34-44 and 46-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,456,350, issued to Ashizawa et al. (hereafter "Ashizawa") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,745,207, issued to Asada et al. (hereafter "Asada"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Ashizawa nor Asada, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Ashizawa and Asada fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device that includes, among other features, "a plurality of common electrodes... having an obtuse angle with the common line;... wherein liquid crystal molecules in a domain between the common electrodes and pixel electrodes have substantially a same rotational direction" as recited in independent claim 34.

Ashizawa and Asada further fail to teach or suggest a method for fabricating a liquid crystal display device that includes "forming a plurality of common electrodes.... having an obtuse angle with the common line;... and providing liquid crystal molecules in a domain between the common and pixel electrodes, wherein the liquid crystal molecules in the domain rotate in substantially a same direction" as recited in independent claim 53 of the present application.

The Office Action concedes that Ashizawa fails to teach all of the features recited in the claims of the present application. To compensate for the deficient teachings of Ashizawa, the Office Action relies upon the teachings of Asada. Based upon the teachings of Asada, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of combine the teachings of Ashizawa and Asada to provide a device having the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant kindly directs the Examiner's attention to FIG. 2 of Asada which provides teachings similar to the Related Art described in the specification of the present application. Specifically, as illustrated in FIGs. 4A and 4B of the present application, the common electrode 11 forms an acute angle with the common line 23 as depicted in a portion "A" of FIG. 4A while the pixel electrode 21 forms an obtuse angle with the common line 23 as shown in a portion "D" FIG. 4A. When a voltage is supplied to the common and pixel electrodes, a distortion of the electric field appears around the acute and obtuse angles, i.e., the portions "A" and "D". Therefore, reverse rotational deformation is caused. Specifically, as illustrated in FIG. 4B, the liquid crystal molecule 41 turns in a clockwise direction, while the liquid crystal molecule 51 turns in a counterclockwise direction (see, Specification, paragraph [0015] - page 6, paragraph [0016]).

The similarity between Asada and the Related Art of the present application is further confirmed in column 2, lines 14-19 of Asada which states "the orientation of the liquid crystal molecules 6a in first display region 20, which are disposed above the center wiring portion 2a in the figure, is opposite to that of the liquid crystal molecules 6b in second display regions 21 disposed below the center wiring portion 2a". As such, Asada fails to teach "wherein liquid crystal molecules in a domain between the common electrodes and pixel electrodes have substantially a same rotational direction" as recited in independent claim 34. Because Asada

fails to teach at least this feature of claim 34, no combination of Asada and Ashizawa would provide a device having the combined features of the present application. Accordingly, claim 34 and its dependent claims 35-44 and 46-52 are allowable over any combination of Ashizawa and Asada.

Additionally, for the reasons discussed above, no combination of Ashizawa and Asada teaches a method of fabricating a liquid crystal display device “wherein the liquid crystal molecules rotate in the domain in a substantially same direction” as recited in independent claim 53 of the present application. Because neither Ashizawa nor Asada teach or suggest the combined features of claim 53, claim 53 and its dependent claims 54-59 are allowable over any combination of Ashizawa and Asada.

Applicant also notes the Office Action has stated, on page 3, that Ashizawa discloses “the device wherein one of the common electrodes elongates along the data line and electrically communicates with adjacent pixel regions (CT). Applicant respectfully submits that Ashizawa fails to teach the features recited in claim 39 and discussed in FIG. 7A and page 18, lines 10-12 of the specification of the present application. Should the rejection be maintained, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to indicate which portion of Ashizawa teaches this feature.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 34-44 and 46-59 are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashizawa and Asada in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,243,146, issued to Rho et al. (hereafter “Rho”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because neither Ashizawa, Asada, nor Rho, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. In particular, Ashizawa, Asada and Rho fail to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device “wherein liquid crystal molecules in a domain between the

common electrodes and pixel electrodes have substantially a same rotational direction” as recited in independent claim 34 from which claim 45 depends.

Applicant has discussed above the distinguishable features of claim 34 over Ashizawa and Asada. Applicant submits Rho fails to remedy the deficient teachings of Ashizawa and Asada such that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated by the teachings of Rho to modify the teachings of Ashizawa and Asada to provide a device having the combined features recited in the claims of the present application. Specifically, the resulting combination of Ashizawa, Asada and Rho would fail to provide a liquid crystal display device “wherein liquid crystal molecules in a domain between the common electrodes and pixel electrodes have substantially a same rotational direction” as recited in independent claim 34.

By virtue of its dependence from claim 34, claim 45 also contains the allowable features of independent claim 34. Accordingly, claim 45 is allowable over any combination of Ashizawa, Asada and Rho. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 45 are respectfully requested.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Application No.: 10/695,908

Docket No.: 8733.494.20-US

Response dated July 12, 2005

10

Reply to Office Action dated April 19, 2005

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: July 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant